STATE OF CALIFORNIA — DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS) STD. 399 (REV. 12/2008)

See SAM Section 6601 - 6616 for Instructions and Code Citations

	See SAM Section 6001 - 60 16 for mistre	actions and code chations			
DEPARTMENT NAME Department of Fish and Game	CONTACT PERSON Mark Stopher	TELEPHONE NUMBER 530.225.2275			
DESCRIPTIVE TITLE FROM NOTICE REGISTER OR FORM 400		NOTICE FILE NUMBER			
Suction Dredge Mining Regulation Amendme	nts	Z			
ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT					
A. ESTIMATED PRIVATE SECTOR COST IMPACTS	(Include calculations and assumptions in the ru	ulemaking record.)			
Check the appropriate box(es) below to indicate wh	nether this regulation:				
✓ a. Impacts businesses and/or employees	4	es reporting requirements			
✓ b. Impacts small businesses	es prescriptive instead of performance				
c. Impacts jobs or occupations		ts individuals			
✓ d. Impacts California competitiveness		of the above (Explain below. Complete the			
		Impact Statement as appropriate.)			
h. (cont.)					
(If any box in Items 1 a through g is checked	d, complete this Economic Impact Statement.)				
2. Enter the total number of businesses impacted: $\underline{\underline{U}}$	Describe the types of busines	ses (Include nonprofits.): Manufacturers of mining			
equipment, mining clubs, retail and service	e businesses.				
Enter the number or percentage of total businesses	s impacted that are small businesses: $\geq 90\%$				
3. Enter the number of businesses that will be created	d: None eliminated:	None			
Explain: Benefits are most likely to be achieved	ved through expansion of existing business	ses.			
4. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts.	Statewide Local or regional (List area	-).			
4. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts: ✓	Statewide Local or regional (List area	s. <u>):</u>			
5. Enter the number of jobs created: $\phantom{00000000000000000000000000000000000$	inated: Describe the types of jobs or	occupations impacted: Retail and service			
businesses (i.e., gas stations, grocery stores, campgrounds, hardware stores, sporting good shops and mining supply stores).					
6. Will the regulation affect the ability of California businesses to compete with other states by making it more costly to produce goods or services here?					
Yes Vo If yes, expla	ain briefly:				
B. ESTIMATED COSTS (Include calculations and ass	sumptions in the rulemaking record)				
What are the total statewide dollar costs that businesses and individuals may incur to comply with this regulation over its lifetime?					
a. Initial costs for a small business: \$ N/A	Annual ongoing costs: \$				
b. Initial costs for a typical business: \$ N/A	Annual ongoing costs: \$	Years:			
c. Initial costs for an individual: \$ N/A	Annual ongoing costs: \$	Years:			
d. Describe other economic costs that may occur:					

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 12/2008)

2. If multiple industries are impacted, ente	er the share of total costs for eac	h industry: None
		ts a typical business may incur to comply with these requirements. (Include the dollar ork, whether or not the paperwork must be submitted.): $\$
4. Will this regulation directly impact house	sing costs? Yes	No If yes, enter the annual dollar cost per housing unit: and the
number of units:		
5. Are there comparable Federal regulation	ons? Yes 🗸 No	Explain the need for State regulation given the existence or absence of Federal
regulations:		
Enter any additional costs to business	es and/or individuals that may be	e due to State - Federal differences: \$
C. ESTIMATED BENEFITS (Estimation o	f the dollar value of benefits is no	ot specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.)
		Currently there is a moratorium on all suction dredging
Briefly summarize the benefits that may in Colifornia. These amendments.		who will benefit:nining and related economic activity and benefits. The amended
		moratorium, and the ultimate level of activity is unknown.
regulations are more restrictive th	an those in place before the h	moratorium, and the dismate level of detivity is disasternis
		or goals developed by the agency based on broad statutory authority? nded to avoid deleterious effects to fish.
3. What are the total statewide benefits fr		e?\$sumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not
specifically required by rulemaking law, bu	ut encouraged.)	,
List alternatives considered and describ	be them below. If no alternatives	were considered, explain why not:
1. No Program Alternative. 2. 19	94 Regulations Alternative.	3. Water Quality Alternative. 4. Reduced Intensity Alternative
Summarize the total statewide costs ar	nd benefits from this regulation a	nd each alternative considered:
Regulation:	Benefit: \$ see Exhibit A	Cost: \$
Alternative 1:	Benefit: \$	
Alternative 2:	Benefit: \$	Cost: \$
		on of estimated costs and benefits for this regulation or alternatives:eport for Alternative 2 (Exhibit B) and the 1994 Regulation
Alternative. Data is not available	for other alternatives. Estima	ates for other alternatives are relative and approximate.
equipment, or prescribes specific action	ons or procedures. Were performa	as an alternative, if a regulation mandates the use of specific technologies or ance standards considered to lower compliance costs?
Explain: This approach was consid	ered and abandoned because	e statutorily set permit fees are insufficient to enforce that approach
E. MAJOR REGULATIONS (Include ca	lculations and assumptions in t	the rulemaking record.) Cal/EPA boards, offices, and departments are subject to the

following additional requirements per Health and Safety Code section 57005.

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 12/2008)

1. Will th	ne estimated costs of this regulation	n to California business enterprises exce	eed \$10 million ? Yes	No (If No, skip the rest of this section.)
2. Brief	ly describe each equally as an eff	ective alternative, or combination of altern	natives, for which a cost-effectivenes	ss analysis was performed:
Alter	native 1:			
Alter	native 2:			
3. For th	ne regulation, and each alternative	just described, enter the estimated total	cost and overall cost-effectiveness r	ratio:
Regu	ulation: \$		Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$	
Alter	native 1: \$		Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$	
Alter	native 2: \$	N.	Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$	
		FISCAL IMPACT	T STATEMENT	
	AL EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVER d two subsequent Fiscal Years.)	NMENT (Indicate appropriate boxes1 thr	ough 6 and attach calculations and	assumptions of fiscal impact for the current
		mately \$ in the cullifornia Constitution and Sections 17500		
	a. is provided in	, Budget Act of	or Chapter	, Statutes of
				dget Act of
		mately \$ in the cur difornia Constitution and Sections 17500		
	a. implements the Federal	mandate contained in		
		ndate set forth by the		
	court in the case of		VS	
	c. implements a mandate of election;	of the people of this State expressed in the	neir approval of Proposition No	at the(DATE)
	d is issued only in respons	e to a specific request from the		
	d. Is issued only in respons			s/are the only local entity(s) affected;
	e. will be fully financed from	n the	(FEES, REVENUE, ETC.)	authorized by Section
		of the		Code;
		each affected unit of local government wh	nich will, at a minimum, offset any ad	Iditional costs to each such unit;
	g. creates, eliminates, or c	hanges the penalty for a new crime or inf	fraction contained in	
3.	Savings of approximately \$	annually.		
\Box_{4}	No additional costs or savings by	ecause this regulation makes only technic	cal, non-substantive or clarifying cha	inges to current law regulations.

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 12/2008)

5.	No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any local entity or program.					
√ 6.	Other. This regulation will increase sales tax revenue to local governments by approximately S	S124,000 annually.				
	CAL EFFECT ON STATE GOVERNMENT (Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)	and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current				
1.	1 . Additional expenditures of approximately \$ in the current State Fiscal Year. It is anticipated that State agencies will:					
	a. be able to absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources.					
	b. request an increase in the currently authorized budget level for thefiscal yea	r.				
2.	Savings of approximately \$ in the current State Fiscal Year.					
	No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any State agency or program.					
√ 4.	Other. No impact in the current fiscal year. In subsequent years, permit fees will be received an	d expended. See Exhibit C.				
C. FISCAL EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS (Indicate appropriate boxes1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)						
8						
1.	. Additional expenditures of approximately \$ in the current State Fiscal Year.					
2.	Savings of of approximately \$ in the current State Fiscal Year.					
3. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program.						
4.	Other.					
FISCAL	OFFICER SIGNATURE	2/18/II				
	CY SECRETARY 1 OVAL/CONCURRENCE	DATE 2/25///				
	RTMENT OF FINANCE PROGRAM BUDGET MANAGER OVAL/CONCURRENCE	DATE				

The signature attests that the agency has completed the STD.399 according to the instructions in SAM sections 6601-6616, and understands the
impacts of the proposed rulemaking. State boards, offices, or department not under an Agency Secretary must have the form signed by the highest
ranking official in the organization.

^{2.} Finance approval and signature is required when SAM sections 6601-6616 require completion of Fiscal Impact Statement in the STD.399.